

OCT 10 2006

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 10, 2006 has been received and considered. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication at page 4 of the Office Action that claims 15-29 and 31 are allowed.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-14 and 32

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11-14 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Movshovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,359,911) in view of Lee (U.S. 6,236,432). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed. Claim 1, from which claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend, recites "identifying a transport packet as containing audio stream data" and "comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data.*" These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

According to the Office Action at page 2, Movshovich allegedly discloses comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data at col. 8, line 27 to col. 9, line 67. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Movshovich does not disclose the recited elements.

Movshovich discloses a PID match unit that identifies transport packets with matching PIDs and forward the packets to a local header unit. *Movshovich*, col. 8, lines 28-30. To identify the transport packets, the PID match unit employs a PID table. *Id.*, col. 8, lines 42-43. According to Movshovich, "[t]he objective of the PID match unit 350 is to extract the PID information from the transport packets of the transport stream, for comparison with known PID table entries." *Id.*, col. 9, lines 17-19. Movshovich further states:

Because the MPEG-2 transport stream can include a multiplex of audio/video programs, the MPEG transport demultiplexor 200 must determine which transport packets are part of the desired program in order to pass them on to the external

PATENT

MPEG decoders for further processing. The transport packets that are not part of the desired program can be discarded. *The PID match unit 304 makes the determination of which PIDs are part of the desired program.*

Id., col. 8, lines 18-26 (emphasis added). Thus, the PID match unit identifies a program associated with each received transport packet by comparing each received transport packet to the PID table. The comparison is performed by the PID match unit without regard to whether a transport packet contains audio stream data and thus the comparison is not performed in response to identifying that the transport packet contains audio data. Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Movshovich of comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data*, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Lee does not remedy the deficiency of Movshovich with respect to claim 1. Lee discloses an MPEG system with a PES decoder. *Lee*, col. 1, lines 5-10. Lee discloses that the MPEG system demultiplexes video and audio PES packet data. *Id.* at col. 2, lines 35-39. Lee does not disclose or suggest comparing a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register to determine a first outcome in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Movshovich and Lee, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. In addition, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 2-9 and 11-14, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. In addition, these claims recite additional novel elements.

With respect to claim 32, the claim recites “means for determining whether to enable audio stream data related to the transport packet to be received by a system or to discard the transport packet based at least in part on a comparison of a value of a first field in the transport packet to a value of a first field register, wherein the comparison is in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data.” As explained above, Movshovich and Lee do not disclose or suggest performing a comparison of a field in a transport packet *in response to identifying the transport packet as containing audio stream data* and therefore necessarily fail to disclose or suggest a means for performing the recited comparison. Accordingly, Movshovich and Lee, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 32.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

PATENT

OCT 10 2006

Obviousness Rejection of Claim 10

At page 4 of the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Movshovich et al. in view of Lee, and further in view of Van Steenbrugge (U.S. Patent No. 6,076,062). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. As explained above, Lee and Movshovich fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1. Further, Van Steenbrugge does not remedy the deficiencies of Lee and Movshovich. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 10, at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. In addition, claim 10 recites additional novel elements.

In view of the forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejections of claims 1-9, 10-14 and 32 is improper. Withdrawal of the rejections and reconsideration of the claims therefore is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicant believes no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-0441.

Respectfully submitted,



Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

10/10/06
Date